

REMARKS

In the present case, claims 233-235, 239-249, 253-263, 267-277, and 281-288 are pending. Applicant will sequentially address the issues raised by the Examiner.

I. The 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 233-234, 236-248, 250-262, 264-276 and 278-288 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Muro et al., JP 63236494 (“MURO”) in view of Baur et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,115,305 (“BAUR”) and Jachimowicz et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,995,718 (“JACHIMOWICZ”).

A. Independent Claims 233, 247, 261, and 275

Independent claims 233, 247, 261, and 275 have been amended to add an additional element [e].

This additional element is supported by at least Figures 20A and 20B and the corresponding text in the original Specification.<sup>1</sup>

MURO, BAUR, and JACHIMOWICZ, separately or in combination, have failed to disclose or suggest a system that has a beam stop prior to the LCDs to absorb unwanted light.

Previously, the Examiner had cited a combination of Atarashi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,172,254 (“ATARASHI”) and BAUR to reject the pending claims. In response to the prior action, Applicant had amended the claims by adding two additional elements (previously numbered [h] and [i]). Applicant hereby expressly retracts the previous claim amendments because the present claim amendment (i.e., addition of element [e]) would also overcome ATARASHI.<sup>2</sup> ATARASHI does not disclose or suggest a system that has a beam stop prior to the LCDs to absorb unwanted light.

---

<sup>1</sup> Of course, the embodiments illustrated in the Figures and/or described in the Specification are merely exemplary. Therefore, the scopes of the claims should not be construed to cover only the exemplary embodiments illustrated and/or described.

<sup>2</sup> Such retracted claim amendments should, therefore, not form the basis for any claim construction or prosecution history estoppel.

Based on the foregoing, all pending claims should now be in condition for allowance.

B. Dependent Claims 234-235, 248-249, 262-263, and 276-277

The above-recited dependent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over MURO in view of one or more other patents. Based on the foregoing regarding the independent claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the §103 rejections of the dependent claims are now moot and these claims are in condition for allowance.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would help advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Roxana H. Yang  
Registration No. 46,788

PATENTESQUE LAW GROUP, LLP  
P.O. Box 400  
Los Altos, CA 94023  
(650) 948-0822